

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action dated on April 6, 2005, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 1, 9, 11-13, 15 and 16 are amended, claims 18-20 are canceled, and no new claims are added; as a result, claims 1-17 are now pending in this application.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Shimada et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,873,738, hereinafter "Shimada").

Shimada describes a communication apparatus which uses cables for connecting circuit boards to external lines and sheet connectors for connecting circuit boards to a power supply.

In contrast, Applicant teaches, and claims in claims 1-17, a system which uses a replacement module to connect two or more circuit boards attached to an embedded backplane. If two circuit boards required higher data transfer bandwidth, the replacement module can be swapped out for one which enables the desired data transfer bandwidth.

Furthermore, Applicant teaches, and claims in claims 11, 12 and 15-17, that the replacement operates in conjunction with a router board to distribute signals from the router board to one or more daughter (circuit) boards, and from one or more daughter (circuit) boards to the router board. Shimada has no such teaching.

Claims 13-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Annapareddy et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,603,044, hereinafter "Annapareddy").

Annapareddy describes a system which uses redundant backplanes to enable communication between two or more circuit boards. Half the signal lines between two circuit boards are connected through a first backplane while the remaining signal lines are connected through the second backplane. Annapareddy does not describe a system which uses a replacement module connected to an embedded backplane to connect two or more circuit boards attached to the same embedded backplane.

In contrast, as noted above, Applicant teaches, and claims in claims 13-17, that a replacement module which includes alignment means for positioning the module with respect to the backplane. The alignment means is configured such that data transfer bandwidth can be

added between the two or more daughter boards plugged into the embedded backplane without replacing the embedded backplane. Given the symmetric nature of the approach described by Annapareddy, one would have to replace both backplanes to add additional bandwidth. Therefore, Annapareddy does not teach an "embedded backplane" as that term is described and claimed by Applicant.

Furthermore, Applicant teaches, and claims in claims 15-17, that the replacement operates in conjunction with a router board to distribute signals from the router board to one or more daughter (circuit) boards, and from one or more daughter (circuit) boards to the router board. Annapareddy has no such teaching.

Reconsideration of claims 1-17 is respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney at (612) 373-6909 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

DAN K. CARTER ET AL.

By their Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612) 373-6909

Date

October 6, 2005

By

Thomas F. Brennan

Thomas F. Brennan
Reg. No. 35,075

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 6th day of October, 2005.

Thomas F. Brennan

Name

Thomas F. Brennan

Signature